

REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Telephone Conversation with Examiner

Applicants kindly thank the Examiner for his helpful comments during the telephone conversation with Applicants' attorney on March 24, 2008. During the discussion, Applicants' attorney discussed the Examiner's recitation of the scope of the elected invention, as set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. Specifically, Applicants' attorney explained that the Examiner's recitation of the scope of the elected invention, particularly where R¹² may not be hydrogen, does not include the elected compound, Example 46. The Examiner agreed, and indicated that the elected invention does include the compound wherein R¹² is hydrogen. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration.

Specification Amendment

The specification has been amended on page 2 to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added to the application by this amendment.

Claim Amendments

The claims have been amended to delete the word "novel", and to remove the non-elected subject matter. No new matter has been added to the application by this amendment.

Claim Objection

The objection to claims 1-30, 33 and 34 for containing non-elected subject matter, and for containing the term "novel", has been rendered moot in view of the claim amendments.

Request for Rejoinder

Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of claims 31 and 32. As stated in MPEP 821.04(a), where restriction was required between independent or distinct products, or between independent or distinct processes, and all claims directed to an elected invention are allowable, any restriction requirement between the elected invention and any nonelected invention that depends from or otherwise requires all the limitations of an allowable claim should be withdrawn. Accordingly, since withdrawn claims 31 and 32 depend upon claim 1, these claims should be rejoined and examined for patentability. The Examiner kindly agreed that these claims should be rejoined during the telephone conversation with Applicants' attorney on March 24, 2008.

Conclusion

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the grounds of objection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Shouji KAMIYA et al.

By: 

Amy E. Schmid
Registration No. 55,965
Attorney for Applicants

AES/emj/nrj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 14, 2008